

Effectiveness of programmes supporting migrants in Africa

*Kerry A. Millington and Mina Bhardwaj
Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine
23 June 2017*

Question

What are the strengths and weaknesses of migration programming that has taken place / is underway in north and sub-Saharan Africa? Specifically, in areas such as livelihoods support, protection of migrants, border security and support for resettlement and voluntary return?

Content

1. Overview
2. Development benefits of migration and addressing the root causes of migration
3. Legal migration and mobility
4. Protection of migrants and asylum seekers
5. Tackling exploitation and trafficking of migrants
6. Voluntary return, local integration and resettlement
7. Other research papers of interest
8. References

The K4D helpdesk service provides brief summaries of current research, evidence, and lessons learned. Helpdesk reports are not rigorous or systematic reviews; they are intended to provide an introduction to the most important evidence related to a research question. They draw on a rapid desk-based review of published literature and consultation with subject specialists.

Helpdesk reports are commissioned by the UK Department for International Development and other Government departments, but the views and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of DFID, the UK Government, K4D or any other contributing organisation. For further information, please contact helpdesk@k4d.info.

1. Overview

Despite a growing body of research on migration and development, the literature highlights the limited empirical evidence available on the effectiveness of migration programmes. The aid-spending departments of the UK government are in the process of identifying how UK aid contributes to tackling the “root causes of mass migration” and developing new, targeted programmes. A recent rapid review of the UK’s aid response to irregular migration in the central Mediterranean recognises that the body of research offers limited guidance on what works (ICAI, 2017). It calls for improved labelling of migration programmes, investment in monitoring and evaluation, and for the UK’s aid response to irregular migration to be informed by robust analysis (ibid).

Best practice in migrant programming has been difficult to draw together but commonalities in what should be considered and recommendations include:

- Donors and international agencies should conduct market, political and policy mapping of the local context before investing, and ensure that programming is designed based on these findings.
- Implementing agencies and partners should prioritise and draw on the knowledge of refugees, host communities and local actors, who are best placed to understand local needs and opportunities and design programmes that complement existing local initiatives.
- Donor governments must promote refugee human and economic rights and could pair livelihood assistance with diplomatic advocacy to promote host-country policies that grant refugees the right to work.
- Programmes must be monitored and evaluated to provide an evidence-base to inform policy. This will involve explicitly identifying the strategic goals of a programme and using these to develop metrics to measure its success in meeting its targets (such as the number of beneficiaries served) as well as the impact on the lives of migrants.
- Programmes must respond and be adaptable to increasingly complex migration patterns.
- There should be improved documentation and analysis of the costs of refugee self-sufficiency and resilience, sustainable voluntary return, local integration and resettlement to permit comparison, where relevant, between programmes and to identify opportunities to pool resources or develop economies of scale.

The Valletta Summit on Migration brings the EU and African countries together in partnership to find common solutions to mutual challenges. It aims to build on existing activities and frameworks for cooperation, focusing on five specific areas. This report is structured around the five Valletta Pillars.

2. Development benefits of migration and addressing the root causes of migration

Sustainable livelihoods and self-reliance

Livelihood programmes are generally divided into “supply-side” and “demand-side” strategies. Supply-side strategies are programmes that aim to boost refugee employability or facilitate entrepreneurship and include skills-building programmes (such as vocational, language and job skills training), technology access and training programmes, and microfinance and credit initiatives. Demand-side strategies are initiatives to create work opportunities or connect

refugees with employers. These include job-creation programmes that pay refugees for work, initiatives to support refugee participation in agriculture and farming, and efforts to connect refugees to online work opportunities. The success of livelihood programmes is often influenced by external factors including:

1. The political and policy context in the host country;
2. The types and extent of economic opportunities available in the host economy;
3. The capacity and willingness of refugees to invest in livelihoods.

Building Livelihood Opportunities for Refugee Populations: Lessons from Past Practice

Jacobsen, Karen and Susan Fratzke (2016) Migration Policy Institute

<http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/building-livelihood-opportunities-refugee-populations-lessons-past-practice>

Most refugee situations are not resolved quickly and instead become protracted, stretching over years or even decades. It is increasingly important to find better ways to integrate refugees into countries of first asylum, by ensuring they have access to livelihood and economic opportunities. Refugee livelihoods is a relatively new field that needs to work through numerous implementation challenges.

The following are identified as shortcomings to refugee livelihood programming:

1. Programmes are launched without first mapping the local political and economic landscape, and therefore are not designed with context-specific barriers or opportunities in mind.
2. Livelihood initiatives are not subject to sufficient evaluation. To date, monitoring efforts have focused on how well programmes meet targets (such as the number of beneficiaries served) rather than their impact on the lives of refugees.
3. There is a lack of coordination between the plethora of international agencies, NGOs and local actors that engage in refugee support and livelihood development, with few international efforts aiming to complement existing local livelihood initiatives.
4. As a relatively new and emerging field, refugee livelihood programming suffers from a lack of trained and knowledgeable staff to design and implement initiatives.

The report suggests the following actions to improve programming:

1. Donors and international agencies should conduct market, political and policy mapping of the local context before investing, and ensure that programming is designed based on these findings.
2. Donor governments could pair livelihood assistance with diplomatic advocacy to promote host-country policies that grant refugees the right to work.
3. Implementing agencies and partners should prioritise the knowledge of refugees, host communities and local actors, who are best placed to understand local needs and opportunities.

Mid-Term Evaluation of UNHCR Graduation Programme in Egypt Final Report

Beit Al Karma Consulting Egypt (2016)

<http://www.unhcr.org/uk/research/evalreports/57a4a6e14/mid-term-evaluation-unhcr-graduation-programme-egypt-2015.html>

The Graduation Approach is a methodology used to address the multiple constraints of the extreme poor through a combination of sequenced, targeted, and time-bound livelihoods interventions including participant selection, assistance for basic needs, training, savings, and asset transfer for business start-ups or job placement. UNHCR established a Graduation Programme pilot in Egypt in 2014, with the overarching objective of supporting refugees in urban areas to sustainably improve their livelihoods and ultimately become self-reliant. The mid-term evaluation of the UNHCR Egypt Graduation Programme presents findings in three key areas: impact, process/performance and project monitoring activities. The report provides evidence-

based recommendations for UNHCR and its partners on the ground to continually improve the implementation and monitoring of the Graduation Programme and thereby increase its impact. The mid-term evaluation triangulates multi-source field data with data provided by the partner monitoring reports and analyses this data to determine what components of the programme have and haven't worked and why, with focus on the perspective of refugee program participants.

Current Programme interventions have realized positive impacts to some extent in areas such as skills development, confidence building and communication abilities, employment generation, business development and income levels. These impacts are promising but primarily limited to the short-term; the Programme still lacks fundamental activities necessary for sustainable medium to long-term impact. The Mid-Term Evaluation suggests that the Graduation Programme can and should be used a tool to respond in a holistic manner to the specific protection risks faced by refugees in Egypt. To date, the Programme has functioned quite separately from protection, even though protection and livelihoods are fully interdependent.

Synthesis report: Evaluating the Effectiveness of DOS/PRM Livelihoods Programs in Ethiopia and Burundi.

Social Impact for USAID

<https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/252134.pdf>

This Synthesis Report is the culmination of a one-year performance evaluation of refugee livelihoods programmes in Ethiopia and Burundi supported by the United States Department of State, Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (DOS/PRM) and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) from 2009-2013. This synthesis report draws on the evaluations of six programmes, that included livelihoods components, implemented by international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in Ethiopia and Burundi.

The key findings and recommendations of the evaluation are:

1. There was a lack of clarity of the livelihood programme goals. The programmes focussed on increasing the capacity of households to provide for themselves, and needed to expand to include stopping abuse. A lot of programmes were in 'post-crises' or development phases so need to include asset protection and advocacy to promote refugee rights. When livelihoods programme goals are implicit rather than clearly stated in programme documents, this creates a hindrance to adequate monitoring (benchmarks) and evaluation, and obstructs the development of an exit strategy. There is also a need to understand the wider context for livelihood programmes in refugee camps.
2. An important consideration is the legal context for refugees and their economic rights. In many refugee settings, the political context in which refugees pursue livelihoods is very unsupportive. In contexts where refugees are not supposed to work, advocacy for livelihoods programming must be carefully considered, in order to avoid making the situation worse.
3. Although a targeted approach for livelihood support on the basis of socio-economic profiling is recommended, it can be difficult to implement in field settings where livelihood capacity and needs are not known and targeting any sub-group can lead to perceptions of unfairness. When targeting is part of a livelihoods programme, it needs to be justified and a full explanation given of how it is to be implemented. Secondly, vulnerability criteria should be adjusted for local context. The evaluation showed that the most vulnerable were generally not targeted in the six programmes reviewed, and many of the evaluated

activities precluded vulnerable groups from participation because the activities required income or physical strength.

4. There were weaknesses in the programme design, implementation and management and the programme cycle to improve livelihood programming was not efficiently utilised. There was an overarching lack of importance placed on conducting assessments to inform programme design; these were largely anecdotal; and lacked an accurate characterisation of the challenges, opportunities, capabilities and gaps within the target population and among the returnees. Particularly in Burundi, livelihoods activities involved one-off distributions of goods such as chickens, seeds, and cuttings, rather than an integrated set of activities and services.

Lessons from introducing a livelihood project for unaccompanied children into an existing child protection programme in the Dadaab refugee camps in Kenya.

Jones (2014) Children and Youth Services Review 47: 239-245

<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2014.09.010>

This article explores the introduction of a livelihood project for unaccompanied children into an existing child protection programme in the Dadaab refugee camp complex in Kenya, with the primary objective of strengthening the household economy of foster families and improving the care of the fostered children.

The article finishes with recommendations that argue for greater acknowledgement and efforts to build on traditional child protection mechanisms as well as greater understanding and consideration of the needs of unaccompanied children within wider debates on child protection systems, as well as better monitoring of the impacts of child protection programmes on the children they serve, and adequate and sustained funding for child protection in emergencies.

Lessons from programme development and recommendations include:

1. Child protection organisations should seek to understand, acknowledge and build on existing traditional mechanisms to protect children, rather than ignore, duplicate or undermine them.
2. The needs of unaccompanied children should be understood and considered within a broader systems-based approach to programming. Throughout any livelihood project concerning children without adequate care, the expectations of the children and their caregivers need to be managed through direct engagement with children and ensuring that they are realistic and that the motivations of caregivers to care for children are not distorted by the offer of livelihood support.
3. Nuanced, innovative methods of impact monitoring that can be implemented even when access is limited need to be designed, including methods specifically designed for monitoring impacts of alternative care and household economy projects. Impact monitoring should be an essential component of the project from the outset and continue for the duration of the project.
4. Where sustained and adequate funding cannot be guaranteed or reasonably assumed, donors and implementing organisations need to make difficult choices about initiating and continuing projects, in order not to put children at greater risk than they would be if no projects are implemented. Should a decision be taken to end livelihood support for children without adequate care, for whatever reasons, a carefully planned exit strategy

should be adopted, in consultation with other agencies providing livelihood support to the concerned population.

Remittances

Remittances are an important source of income for many families in developing countries. However, remittances to developing countries fell for a second consecutive year in 2016, a trend not seen in over 30 years (KNOMAD, 2017). Weak growth in Europe has reduced flows to North Africa and sub-Saharan Africa. Recovery in remittances is expected with improvements in the global economy. The cost of remitting money remains high with the global average cost of sending USD200 remaining at 7.45 percent in the first quarter of 2017; significantly higher than the Sustainable Development Goal target of 3 percent (KNOMAD, 2017).

Out of inequality and poverty: Evidence for the effectiveness of remittances in sub-Saharan Africa.

Eric Akobeng (2016) *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*. 60:207-223
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.qref.2015.10.008>

This paper provides empirical evidence about the effects of financial sector on poverty and inequality and reducing effect of remittances. There is little consensus around the impact of international remittances on poverty, with the evidence on direct effect of remittances on poverty and inequality varying according to the sample. For example it is suggested that migration patterns in eastern Europe or former Soviet countries are such that richer households get more remittances than poorer households and this heightens inequality. However Gupta, Patillo and Wagh (2009) conducted a study on direct effect of remittances on poverty and financial development in 24 sub-Saharan African countries and concluded that remittances reduce poverty and promote development.

This evaluation of the impact of international remittances on inequality and poverty in sub-Saharan Africa is based on a dataset that includes information on international remittances, inequality, and poverty for 41 sub-Saharan African countries. The overall conclusion from the study is that the remittances have significant effects with regards to reducing poverty and inequality. The financial sector is revealed to be an enhancing factor of the remittances and poverty/inequality relationship. The revelations of this study point to the fact that, as far as macro-economic factors are concerned, international remittances have poverty-reducing and income-equalizing effects. These effects are augmented by financial development.

The key policy implications and recommendations from the study are:

1. The International Monetary Fund, the source of data on remittances, should make greater efforts to capture remittances that are transmitted through informal, unofficial means. There is a need for sub-Saharan African policy-makers not to depend solely on foreign aid and foreign direct investment but to look at remittance as a poverty-reducing and income-equalizing tool in designing poverty-reduction strategies.
2. The provision of an enabling environment and policies aimed at reducing the cost of remittance flows must be a top priority. The high cost of using informal networks to remit reduces considerably the possible development impacts of remittances. Well-developed financial infrastructure that improves the accessibility of migrants and their families in the home country to formal financial institutions is a panacea for increasing remittance inflows for poverty reduction.
3. There is the need for sound macroeconomic system and development approaches

encompassing the whole economy with strong involvement of the financial sector to maximise poverty and inequality reducing effects of remittances in sub-Saharan Africa.

Remittances Sent to and From the Forcibly Displaced

Carlos Vargas-Silva (2016). *The Journal of Development Studies*

<http://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2016.1234040>

This paper reviews the literature on remittances in the context of forced displacement. The evidence suggests that remittances are often affected, and affected more strongly, by factors in the displacement context that are different from factors in other contexts, such as 'economic' migration. The roles of regulation, communications, and information, among others, are also likely to be different for International Development Programmes (IPDs) and refugees. Moreover, displacement situations vary widely across countries, and the dynamics in one case might not apply in other cases. The authors conclude that overall, there are many factors related to remittances for which there is insufficient evidence in the displacement context. Future research efforts should concentrate on providing more insights into IDPs in countries and corridors that have not been explored yet and should include a strong quantitative component.

3. Legal migration and mobility

Border security

Building the Future of Africa through Sustainable Border Management Systems: A Case of Southern African States

Milton Gwakwa, Gugulethu Ndebele, gertrude K Kachare. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development*, April 2016; Vol 5 (5): 339-343

<http://www.ijird.com/index.php/ijird/article/viewFile/93252/69095>

The paper debates how Africa, and especially the Southern African Development Community (SADC), can effectively improve its border management models, in as much as indigenous and cultural influences affect the region. The paper describes several resolutions, decisions, policy directive and strategies adopted by African Union and its predecessor Organisation of African Union (OAU).

The paper describes sustainable border management strategies and methodology. The major thrust in building sustainable border management systems should be on reducing bottlenecks that are common throughout the SADC region; customs system modernisation; electronic procedures, standardisation and rationalisation of travel documents; and a pre-clearing cross border travelling models of goods and passengers for example, as seen in air travel when process of verification is done several times before and after flights. The adoption of biometrics is a significant development towards effective border management systems and strengthening sub-regional and regional agencies in data sharing, training and sustained dialogue. The establishment of Joint Border Posts (JBPs)/Border Liaison Offices (BLOs) to increase cross-border communication and sharing of crucial intelligence information is a must do activity for effective and efficient border control; and incorporation of local communities in managing and securing borders.

“Two steps forward one step backwards”: Zimbabwean migration and South Africa’s regularising programme (the ZDP).

Vusilizwe Thebe. *International Migration and Integration* (2017). 18:613–622

<http://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-016-0495-8>

South Africa’s announcement and implementation of a legalising amnesty under the Zimbabwe Documentation Project (ZDP) in 2010 was lauded as a step away from the laissez-faire approach to Zimbabwean immigration. The amnesty, granting migrants stay, work, study and business operation rights in the country on 4-year permits, was clouded by uncertainties and exclusions and implementation hassles. This article explores this legalising amnesty in relation to trends in Zimbabwean immigration over the years.

The process itself was strewn with challenges and has since proven to be an unsuccessful instrument for managing complex mixed migrations like those experienced from Zimbabwe since the 1980s.

Migration from Zimbabwe was a response to incidents of a political nature during both the colonial and postcolonial periods. Despite their illegal status and vulnerability to arrest and deportation, many never got deported, and where deportations were instituted, migrants quickly returned as networking allowed them to return through a variety of illegal channels. In part, all this reflects the complexities in managing mixed migration patterns, as migrants often engage in a variety of strategies to remain, and to legalise their status, and develop complex relationships with locals. The ZDP lacked the three basic elements of a progressive policy: diversity, inclusivity and openness.

Other papers of relevance are

1. Regional Security Cooperation in the Maghreb and Sahel: Algeria’s Pivotal Ambivalence.

Laurence Aida Ammour. *Africa Security Brief*. A publication of the Africa Center for Strategic Studies. No. 18. Feb 2012.

<http://africacenter.org/publication/regional-security-cooperation-in-the-maghreb-and-sahel-algerias-pivotal-ambivalence/>

2. Draft African Union Strategy for enhancing border management in Africa. African Union Border Program.

<http://www.peaceau.org/uploads/AU-DSD-WORKSHOP-MARCH-2013/Border-Programme-docs/AU-BM-Strategy-Revised%20Draft.pdf>

3. Border insecurity in North Africa.

Evie Browne. GSDRC report.

<http://www.gsdr.org/docs/open/hdq945.pdf>

4. Border Security in Ghana: Challenges and Prospects

Margaret Mansa Sosuh. KAIPTC Occasional Paper No.32, March 2011

<https://www.africaportal.org/dspace/articles/border-security-ghana-challenges-and-prospects>

4. Protection of migrants and asylum seekers

Synthesis Report. Evaluating the effectiveness of gender-based violence prevention programmes with refugees in Chad, Malaysia and Uganda

Social Impact Inc. USAID April 2014

<https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/233053.pdf>

This Synthesis Report examines the effectiveness of gender-based violence (GBV) prevention programming funded directly by the US DOS/PRM or indirectly by one of its multilateral partners, UNHCR. The evaluation looked at PRM-funded GBV programs in three regions and field in Chad, Malaysia, and Uganda.

Conclusions and recommendations on the following areas are provided:

- Transforming Socio-Cultural Norms with an Emphasis on Empowering Women and Girls through designing and implementing GBV prevention programs from social norms perspectives and extended funding cycles.
- Rebuilding Family and Community Structures and Support Systems through improved coordination, expanding education opportunities and ensuring that shelters are culturally appropriate.
- Creating Conditions to Improve Accountability Systems and training of staff on awareness, prevention, treatment and self-care; and expanding GBV Information Management Systems (GBVIMS) in other countries.
- Designing Effective Services and Facilities by involving communities in early stages, routinely collecting confidential feedback from survivors about quality of treatment and services.
- Working with Formal and Traditional Legal Systems, raising awareness for legal support, capacity building, investigating cases that are resolved at community and family level, and addressing backlogs and reducing delays in refugee status determination and registration.
- Assessment, Monitoring, and Documentation of GBV through conducting situation analysis, resources for program evaluation, developing programs focussing on healthcare, livelihoods and other areas with measurable objectives.
- Engaging Men and Boys in GBV Prevention and Response and discussing traditional norms associated with femininity and masculinity within their GBV prevention awareness campaigns.,

Effectiveness of Interventions, Programs and Strategies for Gender-based Violence Prevention in Refugee Populations: An Integrative Review.

Tappis, H., Freeman, J., Glass, N., Doocy, S. (2016) PLOS Currents Disasters.

<http://doi.org/10.1371/currents.dis.3a465b66f9327676d61eb8120eaa5499>

This article reports that a range of Gender based violence (GBV) prevention activities recommended by the global humanitarian community are currently being carried out in a variety of settings. However, there remains a limited body of evidence on the effectiveness of GBV prevention programmes, interventions, and strategies, especially among refugee populations. The authors conclude that commonly agreed upon standards or guidelines for evaluation of GBV prevention programming, and publication of evaluations conducted using these guidelines, could assist humanitarian stakeholders to build and disseminate an evidence base of effective GBV

prevention interventions, programmes and strategies. Evaluation of GBV prevention efforts, especially among refugee populations, must be given higher priority to justify continuation or revision of recommended GBV activities/programmes being implemented in diverse humanitarian settings.

5. Tackling exploitation and trafficking of migrants

Migrant Smuggling Data and Research: A global review of the emerging evidence base

International Organization for Migration (2016). Edited by M.L. McAuliffe and F. Laczko.

http://publications.iom.int/system/files/smuggling_report.pdf

The chapter in this report on North Africa (focussing on the countries that feed into the Central Mediterranean route – Algeria, Egypt, Libya and Tunisia) finds that there is a lack of data on smuggling and irregular migration in the region. Most research has focussed on Libya, or on European destinations on the Central Mediterranean route. Also, in terms of smuggling routes in the region, most mapping exercises have focused on routes to Libya, routes from North Africa to Europe, and routes from other countries in the region to Libya.

The chapter outlines areas for further research and makes recommendations for ways in which research and data can be used to inform policies and programmes.

More ongoing analysis of the development of smuggling networks, and the entry of new players in the smuggling market in Libya, particularly as the conflict unfolds and becomes more intertwined with migrant smuggling, would allow better responses to migrant smuggling, better understanding of the motivation of the smugglers and would allow for the better forecasting of future trends. More research among Saharan tribal groups who have been prominent in smuggling in the region for decades would also reveal a lot of useful information about the root causes of migrant smuggling, whether it be economic-, criminal or migration-related.

Irregular migration between West Africa, North Africa and the Mediterranean

Prepared by Altai Consulting for IOM Nigeria, Abuja, November 2015

[http://www.rodakar.iom.int/oimsenegal/sites/default/files/Altai%20Consulting-](http://www.rodakar.iom.int/oimsenegal/sites/default/files/Altai%20Consulting-Free%20Movement%20and%20Migration%20in%20West%20Africa-Final%20Report..._0.pdf)

[Free%20Movement%20and%20Migration%20in%20West%20Africa-Final%20Report..._0.pdf](http://www.rodakar.iom.int/oimsenegal/sites/default/files/Altai%20Consulting-Free%20Movement%20and%20Migration%20in%20West%20Africa-Final%20Report..._0.pdf)

This paper provided background and contextual information about migration and free movement in the ECOWAS region and Mauritania and from the region to Europe for a 2015 conference, themed “Irregular Migration: Challenges and Solutions”. More specifically, the research analyses the current irregular migration in West Africa by looking at: profiles of migrants; drivers of migration; routes of journey; conditions of journey, particularly from the perspective of smuggling and trafficking; current regional (West Africa and Europe) and national frameworks to address irregular migration; recommendations on how the ECOWAS Commission can better address irregular migration in its region.

Recommendations are as follows:

On the Protection of Migrant’s Rights

- At the ECOWAS Level - greater awareness-raising among Member State populations of ECOWAS rights and responsibilities; streamlining national procedures within ECOWAS countries.

- At the EU Level - Information and awareness-raising on the risks of irregular migration (including trafficking in persons) and the available channels for legal migration; assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration (AVRR) in transit countries.
- At all levels - direct assistance to migrants; greater focus and allocation of resources to address trafficking; Migrant Resource and Response Mechanisms to be established along key migration routes and areas, in conjunction with authorities.

On the Legal Framework

- At the ECOWAS Level - update national legislation on the entry and stay of foreigners; streamline national laws in relation to work permits and long-term stay across ECOWAS countries; harmonize relevant national legislation with ECOWAS legal frameworks; build government capacities to implement and develop evidence-based policies; create a regional statistics institute that engages in regional data collection, as well as data analysis; create the framework for on-going regional dialogue and discussion that is not necessarily reliant on MIDWA.
- At the EU Level - promote greater pathways for regular migration to Europe through initiatives such as circular migration schemes and the promotion of private sponsorship schemes.

On Addressing the Drivers of Irregular Migration at Origin

- Labour market assessments in countries of origin that determine gaps in local labour markets and skill development programmes that match the skills of the local labour force with these gaps;
- Identifying industries at the national level that could benefit from foreign labour in the form of migrants from other ECOWAS countries, and facilitating the matching of the two through more efficient work permit acquisition;
- Community stabilisation approaches in areas prone to displacement.

6. Voluntary return, local integration and resettlement

A durable solution for refugees is one that ends the cycle of displacement by resolving their plight so that they can lead normal lives (UNHCR, 2011). The three durable solutions are:

- Voluntary repatriation, in which refugees return in safety and with dignity to their country of origin and re-avail themselves of national protection;
- Local integration, in which refugees legally, economically and socially integrate in the host country, availing themselves of the national protection of the host government;
- Resettlement, in which refugees are selected and transferred from the country of refuge to a third State which has agreed to admit them as refugees with permanent residence status.

The three solutions are complementary in nature and, when applied together, can form a viable and comprehensive strategy for resolving a refugee situation. All three durable solutions should be given full consideration before resettlement is identified as the most appropriate solution.

Vieru (2017) argues for a new approach to integration in host societies: adapting policy to frequent and multidirectional migration and attraction of the highly skilled during this time of

demographic and economic challenges (Vieru, 2017). Migration is now more complex and competitive requiring an updated response. Host countries and homelands should tap into the economic and social potential of highly-skilled migrants through integration policy to result in more stable and mutually beneficial development for all involved.

Sustainable voluntary return

Why Assisted Return Programmes Must Be Evaluated: Insights from the project 'Possibilities and Realities of Return Migration'

PRIO Policy Brief August 2014

http://file.prio.no/Publication_files/prio/Paasche,%20Erland%20Why%20Assisted%20Return%20Programmes%20Must%20Be%20Evaluated%20PRIO%20Policy%20Brief%2008-2014.pdf

As part of migration management, Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration programmes (AVRRs) aim to incentivise return to and support reintegration in the country of origin. These programmes are considered less costly, more humane, simpler and cheaper than deportation. However, whilst AVRR is an increasing policy priority, developing systematic knowledge of programme effects and effectiveness has not been. Neglecting post-return realities is problematic and does not produce evidence-based policies. This policy brief outlines some of the reasons why AVRR programmes must be monitored and evaluated and provides a list of analytical questions as a guide to policy-makers to carry out a comprehensive evaluation or for questions to be singled out for a more targeted approach.

Comparative Research on the Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration of Migrants IOM (2015)

https://www.iom.int/sites/default/files/our_work/DMM/AVRR/IOM-KoserKushminder-Comparative-Research-on-AVRR-2015.pdf

This report presents the findings of a study that explored the factors influencing the decision to return, including the role played by return policy interventions. Fifteen countries of origin, transit and destination were studied, making it one of the largest comparative recent projects on this topic. However, the sample size of respondents in each country was relatively small.

Key findings of the study include:

- Respondents ranked factors influencing their return decision as follows: conditions in the country of destination (the difficulty of finding employment/no right to work; being tired of living as an undocumented migrant), social factors (a desire to reunify with family at home), policy interventions (the opportunity to benefit from voluntary return programmes) and conditions in the country of origin (job prospects at home).
- Most of the research on the return decision-making process indicates that the removal of root causes may not be sufficient to ensure sustainable return.
- There is a degree of consensus in the research that the availability of assistance is not a key factor in determining whether migrants will return voluntarily.

The study also explored the linkages between the return decision, reintegration and sustainable return. The data suggests that a lack of integration in the destination country may impact reintegration on return. Re-migration is not an adequate proxy for reintegration or sustainable return. The report also outlines directions for further research and policy implications arising from this study (final chapter). There is space for IOM, academics and other actors involved or interested in return migration to conduct richer and more consistent evaluation of reintegration.

Reintegration: Effective approaches

Ana Fonseca, Laurence Hart and Susanne Klink (2015) IOM

https://www.iom.int/sites/default/files/our_work/DMM/AVRR/Reintegration-Position-Paper-final.pdf

Reintegration (economic, social and psychosocial) is an essential part of return migration, as it empowers and protects returnees by providing them with the necessary tools and assistance for their reinsertion into the society of their country of origin, while generally contributing to the sustainability of return. IOM's project experiences indicate that return will likely be more sustainable if the decision to return is an informed and voluntary one and is supported by appropriate reintegration assistance.

This report outlines promising reintegration practices and contributes to informed discussion among stakeholders. The authors argue for the importance of reintegration being sustainable, measurable, balanced, complementary and innovative, indicating principles and practices leading to these parameters. Also, that there is no one-size-fits-all solution to reintegration approaches. Reintegration in countries in transition is outside the scope of this report, as these countries face very different challenges because of large flows of refugees and displaced persons.

Assisted voluntary return and reintegration: at a glance 2015

International Organization for Migration (2015)

https://www.iom.int/sites/default/files/our_work/DMM/AVRR/AVRR-at-a-glance-2015.pdf

This report gives a broad overview of IOM's AVRR trends, developments and related activities in 2014 with a breakdown of summary statistics on a regional and country level. Although IOM is promoting a targeted approach based on the specific needs of each individual, in addition to the regular AVRR assistance, IOM is providing assistance to three different vulnerable groups: unaccompanied migrant children, migrants with health-related needs, and trafficked persons.

The report provides 'showcase' examples of re-integration and effective approaches taken in several countries. The Regional Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration Program for Stranded Migrants in Libya (RAVL) is an AVRR programme implemented by IOM Libya between February 2012 and May 2014. IOM provided beneficiaries with assistance to return to their location of origin within their home country, along with financial assistance (in-kind) to support their reintegration (€800). An evaluation found that IOM staff in both sending and receiving missions were fully engaged in the programme and able to provide full assistance to the returnees, but were hampered by a lack of resources and limited reintegration grants. While the effect of the reintegration programme was determined as positive in most cases, additional human and financial resources would have been necessary to deliver longer and more in-depth reintegration assistance. Recommendations included the establishment of transit centres for better psychological support in pre-departure and post arrival, as well as increased information sharing between IOM sending and receiving missions.

Return Migration and Economic Outcomes in the Conflict Context

Fransen et al World Development 2017. 95:196-210.

<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.02.015>

Knowledge about the economic implications of refugee return is essential to develop adequate policies in the post-conflict period. This paper explores the differences in economic outcomes between return migrant households and non-migrant households using panel data from Burundi,

a country which experienced large-scale conflict-led emigration and massive post-war refugee return. Findings from the study are as follows:

- Refugee returnee households have significantly lower levels of livestock than other households.
- Refugee returnee households also report lower values of subjective economic well-being.
- High inactivity rates while in displacement might affect the future economic outcomes of refugee returnees.

A key result from this paper is that the economic dynamics of returnees in the conflict context are substantially different from the evidence in the “economic” migration context. In the conflict context, migration and return could take place even when not economically beneficial, leading to a substantial negative economic gap between migrants and non-migrants. The results from this article highlight the importance of allowing refugees the opportunity to engage in employment and other economic activities while in displacement and the need for continuous support after returning home.

Summary Report: Returns to Somalia: Setting protection and livelihood standards: An assessment of DRC’s AVRR pilot programme to Mogadishu

<https://drc.dk/media/2568354/drc-avrr-external-report-final.pdf>

The study is an evaluation of the pilot phase of the AVRR programme from Norway to Somalia involving a small population but a representative sample and an equally diverse set of migration projects. The study provides an assessment of the reintegration process of the returnees.

The key findings are as follows:

1. Protection: none of the returnees mentioned specific concerns over their physical security above locals, social inclusion and any problems with regards to their legal protection.
2. Livelihoods: Most returnees identified considerable gap between earning and family expenses to meet family needs; and that there was a mismatch between the jobs and prior experiences and skills sets. The economic isolation threatened re-integration. Most preferred support with business start-up as it required shorter process than going for a job placement.
3. Programme assessment: The absence of a comprehensive monitoring framework in the pilot programme is the key strategic gap to be filled moving forward. The motivation to engage with AVRR was not very high among the returnees and there is a need to outreach proactively. There is a need to provide individual counselling, particularly psychosocial counselling.

The key recommendations are:

1. Develop a 12 month return comprehensive monitoring framework within the programme.
2. Hire returnees as social facilitators and mentors to other returnees (as part of monitoring framework)
3. Develop STEP-UP module to complement the AVRR package to strengthen support systems, skills training and mentorship.

4. Form private-public partnerships to explore alternative livelihood opportunities for returnees.
5. Carry out a comprehensive protection assessment, medical care and psychosocial well-being and counselling.

Resettlement

Taking Stock of Refugee Resettlement: Policy Objectives, Practical Tradeoffs, and the Evidence Base

Hanne Beirens and Susan Fratzke (2017) Migration Policy Institute.

<http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/taking-stock-refugee-resettlement-policy-objectives-practical-tradeoffs-and-evidence-base>

Policymakers need to ensure their resettlement programmes are efficient and effective. Yet there is limited evidence on comprehensive monitoring and evaluation to inform policymakers. This report explores several resettlement programmes to identify the core questions and tradeoffs policymakers face as they introduce new initiatives or scale up existing efforts. It also identifies gaps in data collection and analysis.

To improve the evidence base, the report offers several recommendations, including:

- Explicitly identify the strategic goals of a programme and use these to develop metrics to measure its success.
- Look beyond basic counts of persons served to evaluate the process of resettlement itself—including the types and extent of orientation activities, how long refugees wait before being resettled, and policies governing legal status and settlement location at destination—and how it influences refugee outcomes.
- Improve documentation and analysis of the costs of each aspect of resettlement programmes, making it possible to identify opportunities to pool resources or develop economies of scale.

7. Other research papers of interest

Helpdesk reports available from K4D:

Emergency humanitarian response to longer-term development in refugee crises.

Thompson, S. (2017). K4D Helpdesk Report. Brighton, UK: Institute for Development Studies. 2017

Developmental impacts of interventions to support legal migration.

Idris, I. K4D Helpdesk Report 110. Brighton, UK: Institute for Development Studies. 2017

Migration and the Sustainable Development Goals

ODI, with the support from the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, is exploring the relationship between migration and key development issues in a series of eight policy briefs throughout 2016 and 2017. The briefs are part of ODI's work on 'Leave no one behind: the first 1000 days of the SDGs'.

<https://www.odi.org/projects/2849-migration-and-sustainable-development-goals>

Climate change, migration and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

Emily Wilkinson, Lisa Schipper, Catherine Simonet and Zaneta Kubik. Briefing paper. December 2016

<https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/11144.pdf>

Sustainable cities: internal migration, jobs and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

Paula Lucci, Dina Mansour-Ille, Evan Easton-Calabria and Clare Cummings. Briefing paper. October 2016

<https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/10959.pdf>

Health, migration and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

Olivia Tulloch, Fortunate Machingura and Claire Melamed. Briefing paper July 2016.

<https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/10761.pdf>

Women on the move: migration, gender equality and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Tam O'Neil, Anjali Fleury and Marta Foresti. Briefing paper. July 2016.

<https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/10731.pdf>

The following helpdesk reports produced by GSDRC may also be of interest:

Refugee return in protracted refugee situations

<http://www.gsdr.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/1282-Refugee-return-in-protracted-refugee-situations.pdf>

Sustainable livelihoods in Ugandan refugee settings

<http://www.gsdr.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/HDQ1401.pdf>

Responding to the Syrian refugee crisis in Lebanon – lessons learned

<http://www.gsdr.org/docs/open/HDQ987.pdf>

Preventing conflict between refugees and host communities

<http://www.gsdr.org/docs/open/HDQ845.pdf>

Early warning models for irregular migration

<http://www.gsdr.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/HDQ1241.pdf>

Scoping study on defining and measuring distress migration (co-produced with FAO)

<http://www.gsdr.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/HDR1406.pdf>

Border insecurity in North Africa (2013)

<http://www.gsdr.org/docs/open/hdq945.pdf>

Drivers of irregular migration in North Africa (2015)

<http://www.gsdr.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/HDQ12711.pdf>

8. References

- KNOMAD. (2017). *Migration and Remittances. Recent Developments and Outlook. Special Topic: Global Compact on Migration*. Retrieved from <http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/992371492706371662/MigrationandDevelopmentBrief27.pdf>
- UNHCR. (2011). *UNHCR Resettlement Handbook: Division of International Protection*. Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.org/46f7c0ee2.pdf>
- Vieru, M. (2017). *Integration in Host Societies and Development: Adapting Policy Approaches to the New Mobility*. Retrieved from <http://www.knomad.org/publication/integration-host-societies-and-development-adapting-policy-approaches-new-mobility>

Suggested citation

Millington, K.A. and Bhardwaj, M. (2017). *Effectiveness of Programmes Supporting Migrants in Africa*. K4D Helpdesk Report. Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies.

About this report

This report is based on five days of desk-based research. The K4D research helpdesk provides rapid syntheses of a selection of recent relevant literature and international expert thinking in response to specific questions relating to international development. For any enquiries, contact helpdesk@k4d.info.

K4D services are provided by a consortium of leading organisations working in international development, led by the Institute of Development Studies (IDS), with Education Development Trust, Itad, University of Leeds Nuffield Centre for International Health and Development, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine (LSTM), University of Birmingham International Development Department (IDD) and the University of Manchester Humanitarian and Conflict Response Institute (HCRI).

This report was prepared for the UK Government's Department for International Development (DFID) and its partners in support of pro-poor programmes. It is licensed for non-commercial purposes only. K4D cannot be held responsible for errors or any consequences arising from the use of information contained in this report. Any views and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of DFID, K4D or any other contributing organisation. © DFID - Crown copyright 2017.

